



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion, ability, and zeal, for engaging in the task; but having actually engaged in it with no little energy, and having set, of themselves, about introducing such reforms as to them appeared to be needed, before any foreigners came to assist in the work—as did, subsequently, under a Papal sanction, the King of England and his helpers in the subjugation of Ireland.

But, whatever ecclesiastical reforms the Irish themselves, or the Danes, or English, or bishops of Rome, may have introduced or attempted in this country, subsequently to the Anglo-Norman invasion, sufficiently certain it is that the abolition of marriage among the clergy was not, at all events, a feat of their accomplishment. But, as its use was allowed among the said clergy, from the days of St. Patrick to the date of the Invasion,* so was it also continued in the ages which come after, from the Invasion to the Reformation; as we hope satisfactorily to prove to the reader of our next paper.

R. K.

THE WAR.

As many of our readers, like ourselves, may have a deep personal interest in friends and loved ones engaged in the present war, we think it may be acceptable to them to be provided with a form of prayer for those on whom their affections are so engaged.

We ask our readers to consider, if every family in Ireland were daily to join in offering up such prayer to God, might we not hope for an answer to our prayers, from Him who heareth prayer?

In ancient times, such prayers were always "Litanies"—that is, the prayers were so drawn up, that all might join and take their part in them. It is a cold thing for one to pray, and all the rest to listen. Who would not wish to pray themselves, for those they love, in their hour of danger? Our Litany is intended for this purpose. It is intended that the one who leads the prayer, should read with reverence what is written in the usual print, and that all the rest should join in answering what is written in the *italic* or sloping print. Thus all join in praying. This was the method of the ancient Litanies.

While we are on this subject, we invite our readers to give their contributions to "the Patriotic fund," which is now being raised for the relief and support of the widows and orphans of the soldiers and sailors who fall in this war. Who would not contribute to such a fund? Who would not wish to give comfort to the soldier's heart, as he lies bleeding on the battle field or mangled in the military hospital? and what comfort can we give them, like the assurance that those they have loved best on earth, in whom their dying wishes centre—their widows and their orphans—shall have their inheritance in the gratitude of their country? This is the object of the Patriotic Fund. The soldiers hear of it. How many a soldier as he stands steadfast before the hail of bullets, or rides to death as the light cavalry so lately did, will think upon that "Patriotic Fund"! What Irishman would not contribute to it?

We deeply regret that some, to check the flow of national sympathy, have circulated the unfounded calumny, that this fund is to be used for proselytizing purposes. If there be any ground for such a charge, let a memorial be presented to the Queen; or, let a motion be made in Parliament now assembled. If grounds can be shown, none are more ready than we to join. The Samaritan did not stop to say to the Jew, "If you will worship at Gerizim, I will heal your wounds;" that was not our Saviour's story, when he said "Go, and do thou likewise." Any such abuse of the "Patriotic Fund" would be a foul iniquity; for that which is morally wrong can never be religiously right. Nothing could be more wicked than such an abuse of such a fund, except the conduct of those who seek to stop the generous current of a nation's sympathy, and then shrink from coming forward, in the light of day, to prove their dark insinuations. If, then, as we venture to predict, no such memorial will be presented to the Queen—no such motion made in Parliament, that inquiry should be immediately instituted, and exposure made—let our readers believe that the calumny is unfounded, and let them come forward, like Irishmen, to show their generous sympathy with the gallant defenders of their country.

Wherever there are not local associations to receive such contributions, we are ready to receive post-office orders, payable to our publisher, William Curry; or postage stamps enclosed to him, and to acknowledge the receipt in our pages.

And we ask the prayers of our countrymen for the soldiers, the sick, the wounded, and the mourners in this war.

A LITANY TO BE USED IN TIME OF WAR.

Almighty and Merciful God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all that flee to thee for succour, we beseech thee, in this time of war, for our country and for the Queen whom thou hast set over us, for her councillors and officers, for her soldiers and sailors, and for all who are in trouble or sorrow through the war,

We beseech Thee to hear us good Lord.

That Thou wilt be her defender and keeper, giving her victory over all her enemies,

We beseech Thee to hear us Good Lord.

That thou wilt grant her councillors wisdom, and endue her officers with courage and humanity,

We beseech thee to hear us, Good Lord.

That Thou wilt bless the arms of our country, to the restoration of peace, justice, and equity, in the world,

We beseech Thee to hear us, Good Lord.

That Thou wilt be merciful to our soldiers and sailors (especially we pray thee for), that thou wilt succour and comfort them in all their distresses, and preserve them in the day of battle, and make them merciful in the hour of victory; and so teach them to number their days, that they may apply their hearts unto wisdom.

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt look down from heaven upon the sick and the wounded (especially); behold, visit, and relieve them, and restore them to health, if it be thy gracious will,

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt sanctify their sufferings, that they may lead the rest of their lives in Thy fear and to Thy glory; or else fit and prepare them for their departure hence, in the faith and fear of Thy Holy name, and lift up the light of thy countenance upon them, and give them peace, through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ our Lord,

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt be gracious to those whose souls are in trouble for sin, that they may have hope through Christ; that Thou wilt not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax,† nor shut up Thy tender mercies in displeasure,‡ but make them to hear of joy and gladness, that the bones which Thou hast broken may rejoice,

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thy blessing may be upon all who have gone forth to minister to their spiritual or temporal comfort,

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt have compassion upon all who are in affliction or sorrow for the danger or the loss of their dear ones; that Thou wilt heal the broken-hearted, and comfort all that mourn,§

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That when Thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world may learn righteousness,||

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt accomplish the time when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more,¶

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

That Thou wilt accomplish the number of thine elect, and hasten thy kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy Holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ, our Lord,

We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.

Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth, As it is in heaven; Give us this day our daily bread; And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us; And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil; For thine is the kingdom, And the power, And the glory, For ever and ever. Amen.

Almighty God, who hast given us grace at this time with one accord to make our prayers and supplications unto Thee; and dost promise that when two or three are gathered together in Thy name, thou wilt grant their requests; fulfil now, O Lord, the desires and petitions of thy servants, as may be most expedient for them; granting us in this world knowledge of thy truth, and in the world to come life everlasting. Amen.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. Amen.—2nd Cor. xiii. 14.

RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

(Continued from page 135.)

The following arguments, are given in the Resumé as those urged by Mr. Gretton in support of the authority of the Roman See, p. 9:—

"Before the end of the 1st century under St. Clement, the 4th Pope, a schism, or, as St. Clement himself described it, 'a foul and unholy sedition,' having broke out in the Church of Corinth, an appeal was made to the Church of Rome for its interference and advice. The Epistle which the Holy Father addressed to the Corinthians is to be found in the *Epistolæ Patrum de Prey, Basle, 1742.*"

"On the authority of Father Lacordaire, whose works (from whence they are quoted) have received the sanction of the Catholic Church, the following were offered:—

"At the end of the 2nd century, the Churches of Asia persisted in celebrating Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon; like the Jews, whilst the Christians of the west on the Sunday which follows that day; the Pope, St. Victor I., excommunicated them."

"In the 3rd century, St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, with a council of sixty bishops of Africa decided that the children of heretics should be rebaptised; the Pope, St. Stephen I., opposed it and menaced them with excommunication, and St. Cyprian, great man as he was, was obliged to bend."

"St. Denis, Patriarch of Alexandria, the first of the patriarchates of the east, issued certain doubtful propositions on the Trinity; many bishops, being alarmed, addressed the Sovereign Pontiff, and St. Denis was obliged to write an apologetic letter to the Pope."

"St. Irenæus, a writer so near the Apostolic times as to have had for his instructor in Christianity, St. Polycarp, a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, says—"

"We can enumerate those bishops who were appointed by the Apostles and their successors down to ourselves, none of whom taught or even knew the wild opinions of these men (heretics). However, as it would be tedious to enumerate the whole list of successions, I shall confine myself to that of Rome, the greatest and most ancient and illustrious Church, founded by the glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul; receiving from them her doctrine which was announced to all men, and which, through the succession of her bishops, is come down to us. Thus we confound all those who, through evil designs, or vainglory, or perverseness, teach what they ought not; for to this Church, on account of its superior headship (potentiorum principatum), every other must have recourse—that is, the faithful of all countries, in which Church is preserved the doctrine delivered by the Apostles."—Adv. Hæres, Lib. 3.

"St. Cyprian—Primacy was given to Peter to show that there is but one Church and one Chair. Does he who abandons the Chair of Peter, upon which the Church is founded, flatter himself that he is in the Church?"—De Unit. Ecc.

"St. Cyprian—Moreover, after all this, having had a pseudo bishop set up for themselves by heretics, they dare to sail and to carry letters from schismatic and profane men to the Chair of St. Peter, and to the principal Church, whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise; nor do they consider that the Romans are those (whose faith was praised in the preaching of the Apostle) to whom faithlessness cannot have access."—Ep. 55, ad. Cornel.

"St. Cyprian also calls the Roman Church the *Root and Matrix of the Catholic Church.*"—Cyp. Op., Ep. 65, Perisse Freres. Paris.

"St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevis, in Numidia, in the fourth century—You cannot deny that St. Peter, the chief of the Apostles, established an Episcopal Chair at Rome. This Chair was one, that all might preserve unity, by the union which they had with it, so that whoever set up a Chair against it, should be a schismatic and an offender."—De Schism. Donat. Paris and Mayence.

"St. Jerome—I am following no other than Christ, united to the communion of your Holiness—that is, to the Chair of Peter. I know that the Church is founded on that Rock. Whoever eateth the Lamb out of that house, is a profane man. Whoever is not in the ark shall perish by the flood."—Ep. 15, ad. Damas.

Dr. M.—It certainly is very striking that you so systematically avoid the Scriptures, and the real questions at issue. The reason why you are thus anxious to escape from the former is plain enough—they give no support to your doctrines. For this cause. Those doctrines were never derived from the Bible, but grew gradually into existence, and in assumption. In order to support them, recourse was had, in after years, to God's Word. Certain passages, from which they were not at all derived, were tortured into proof. Hence, the true reason of the extreme weakness of the Scripture proof which you attempt to give of your peculiar tenets. That such has been your mode of procedure is evident from these circumstances. You dare not attempt the only proof which can, upon your own principles, fairly establish your case by Scriptural testimony. If the passages from the Bible which your Church now adduces, had really been the source from whence her doctrines were derived, it will be easy for you to establish this, by showing that early Christian writers did take those passages, and did explicitly assign to them that meaning which your Church, since the Council of Trent, has ascribed. But this you will not attempt. You cannot produce a single instance where it was done. Hence, it is clear such passages were not the originals from whence your peculiar doctrines were deduced. The Scripture was an afterthought. The doctrines, as you now hold them, grew gradually in assumption from century to century, and their growth can be easily accounted for. It was, of course, necessary to make some defence of them from revelation. But as your Church could not find in it, as might be expected, any good defence, she was constrained to take the best she could get, and make up for lack of evidence by asserting her infallibility, for the truth of her modern interpretations. She has put a sense which she did not find in them on such passages, and, by authority, created a new meaning. If this account of the present Scriptural argument be untrue, you can at once refute it, by taking *seriatim* the passages of Scripture

* Additional evidence on this point will, it is believed, be furnished, when the important collection of the Breton Laws, now in course of preparation for publication, shall have issued from the press.

† Here any may be mentioned in whom the persons assembled are especially interested.

† Matt. xii. 20. § Ps. lxxvii. 9. § Isaiah lxi. 1-2. ¶ Isaiah xxi. 9. ¶ Isaiah ii. 4.

which you maintain to be the basis of your claims, and then show, from those early writings which we possess, that their authors did really, by their own words, give to them that interpretation which you now give. This you will not attempt to do.

In point of fact, what I am now requiring is the only proof, by your own principles, open to you. For, you do not permit men to exercise their own judgment upon those passages of Scripture which contain articles of faith. Infallibility you cannot assume when called on to prove it. Take, then, now, the questions at issue in our present discussion, the infallibility of, either Church or Pontiff—which it be, or whether it be of both, you have nowhere yet decided—take your present doctrine of the Pontiff's supreme jurisdiction of power over the whole Church of Christ. How will you proceed in the Scriptural proof? What is your rule for the interpretations of the passages you adduce? It must be one of three things. The natural judgment of men duly exercising the same reason which they use in all matters of practical importance; or it must be infallibility interpreting them; or the universal authority of the Fathers testifying, by their united sanction, to the truth of your present interpretation.

But the first of these methods you prohibit; the second you cannot assume when called on to prove it. You have, therefore, nothing left but to test the truth of your doctrines by the only criterion which remains, and which you assert to exist—the according and universal consent of the Fathers.

Here again your pretensions have driven you into a fatal difficulty. If your Church did not assert that there really was such an according witness from the earliest times—if she did not allege that there really was a flowing stream of consent testimony to the truth of her doctrines—it is manifest she would have no proof at all left her. Such testimony she does assert; and she has succeeded in imposing upon her members the reception of an assertion instead of the truth of a fact. She has so jumbled together infallibility with assertion, that her members do not distinguish. They take her infallibility not only as a guarantee for interpretations of Scripture, but likewise as proof for the truth of historic allegations. They do not limit the claim to the proof of doctrines from the Bible, but believe, moreover, that she is as infallible when asserting a fact, as when deriving a doctrine; as a witness or as an interpreter.

My present position is this—your pretensions have forced you to make a claim which is fatal to you. Equally fatal would it have been had you not made it. Prohibiting the exercise of private judgment upon passages of Scripture containing articles of faith debared from assuming infallibility when called on to prove it, you had no option, because no other proof of your pretensions, but the dogmatic averment that there really did exist one united voice of all antiquity deposing to the truth of your doctrines. Nothing less than this could prove your case. It would not do simply to say that some Fathers held your views; for if there was any difference of opinion among them, this would be to let in what you, with so much worldly wisdom, so well prohibit—private judgment. Hence, you were constrained, by your position, and because of your pretensions, to hazard the daring assertion, that there really did exist—that full proof can be produced of its existence—the consent authority of the Fathers deposing, with full unanimity, to the existence of your modern doctrines in the Church of Christ from the earliest period. This you do assert; this you do teach; and this I shall now put you to prove in the two questions which we are at present discussing; and here I say your pretensions will fall by their own weight.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

ARE THE PRIESTHOOD SINCERE?

[We have great pleasure in presenting to our readers a translation of the following letter from the Abbé Miel, which we think valuable, not only as coming from the pen of one intimately acquainted with the state of the priesthood in France, of which he was so lately a distinguished member, but as evincing the same spirit of Christian moderation which rendered his former letter, published in our September number, so touchingly interesting.]

(TRANSLATION.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have every day occasion to observe that many evangelical Christians are persuaded that the greater part of the Roman Catholic priesthood are wanting in sincerity, and do not themselves believe in what they are commissioned to teach to others. That it may be so, more or less, in Protestant countries, is possible, though I am not aware of it. But as concerning the countries where the Roman system is dominant, and especially as concerning France, of which the clergy everywhere enjoy particular and deserved consideration, I know, and owe it to truth, as well as to justice, to say, that the clergy in general do not feel the least doubt with regard to the doctrines which they preach in the name of Rome. How that comes to pass, and what is the nature of that sincerity, it will not be difficult nor,

perhaps, needless to explain, and such is the object of this letter.

If there be any one point of its organisation in which the Church of Rome shows herself particularly skilful, it is beyond contradiction in the education of her clergy. You cannot imagine how marvellously everything is combined in order to fix firmly in the intellect and affections of candidates for orders what is called faith—faith, be it remarked, not in our Saviour, nor in Scripture, but faith in the Church herself. What precautions are taken to prevent a doubt from reaching the understanding, or to repel it victoriously if ever it should present itself there! The principles inculcated in young candidates for holy orders, the lessons given to them, the books placed in their hands, every thing concurs and tends to the same object. And these operations are certain of success, because they are directed against simple, unsuspicious souls, who, as it were, lend themselves of their own accord, without resistance, to the impressions. The seminaries are recruited, in fact, from the country districts. The pupils are, for the most part, children of the lower orders, who have attracted attention by their happy disposition, by their assiduity in attending religious ceremonies, and by the docility they display to the lessons of the priests. When they quit their families to enter the first or lower seminaries they certainly have but little knowledge of religion. This, however, they know perfectly well (for they have been taught it from their infancy), that in order to be Christians they must believe firmly, and under pain of damnation, everything which is believed and taught by the Roman Church. And as they have been equally taught that the Church means the parish priest and every priest approved by the bishop, they have an unbounded reliance in the word of the priest. The priest is in their eyes a man altogether beyond and above the rest of mankind, he exercises over them all the ascendancy not only of learning and virtue, of which they form to themselves a very high opinion, but of a celestial mission of a divine nature. They listen to him as the oracle of God, not admitting the possibility of deceiving them, or of his deceiving himself. His lessons are the more impressive from being given with all the force of simple affirmations—“That is so;” “That is not so.” So far is this carried, that they have not even an idea of a religious discussion or controversy. Even in the world, in which they are received before their admission to the college, and where they again appear from time to time during the vacations, no discussion is ever heard upon these subjects. By common agreement, in all Roman Catholic countries, the study of religion is considered the business exclusively of the priest, the believer has only to gather at the foot of the pulpit the fruits of that study. The few exceptions which might be produced against this rule would only serve to establish its truth.

Nevertheless, when the understanding of the pupil of the seminary is a little more developed—when he commences to make use of his own judgment in the domain of natural science—it sometimes happens that reason endeavours to vindicate her right to be heard in matters of religion also, and seeks to qualify the doctrine presented to her as alone containing eternal truth. But the confessor is ever at hand to guard his spiritual son against this dangerous snare. Reason is silenced as being merely the voice of pride; or else is deluded by the promise of having her suggestions examined at another stage, during the term of study at the upper seminary.

At last arrives the solemn epoch, in which the theological education is completed—an epoch the most critical of all. If the edifice of belief does not crumble then, it is usually fixed for ever. Every history which is not in every point in perfect harmony with the doctrine of Rome is strictly forbidden. Even Bailie's *Treatise on Theology*, which has for a number of years been almost exclusively used in our seminaries in France, has just been placed in the index of forbidden works, on the ground that it does not profess *Ultramontanum* with sufficient openness. This is the doctrine which must, at any sacrifice, prevail. Whether knowingly or not, the teachers do not hesitate, with this object in view, to mis-state facts and to misquote texts, as I shall soon have occasion to demonstrate. And yet, upon the slightest reflection, how flimsy are the foundations upon which is reared so colossal a structure!—how weak the arguments!—how inconclusive the evidence!

Well then, would you believe it, the circumstance which ought to shake the faith of the neophyte is precisely that which in most cases serves to fix it. Taking this proposition as a starting point, which they deem exempt even from the possibility of attack—viz., that whatever is taught in the name of Rome is infallibly true, the argument proceeds thus:—“Reason is inadequate to demonstrate such or such a truth; faith, therefore, is a matter of necessity.” And, closing their eyes, they precipitate themselves into the bosom of a faith justly called blind.

It is an analogous reasoning to what I have often heard repeated by sincere Roman Catholics after visiting the eternal city. Deeply affected by the scandals of every description pervading the city of the Pontiffs,

they deduced from these very scandals a proof of the divine nature of the Church of Rome, and of the permanent protection afforded to it by the Holy Ghost, alleging it to be manifest that that Church could not, without such protection, exist for an hour in the midst of such corruptions.

Nor is this all, although it would be something, no doubt, to have thus brought the young student in theology to admit as a necessity this belief in the Church. But, after having thoroughly impressed the idea in his mind that a simple doubt kills faith—after having exhibited in the most hideous colours all who have ever shaken off the yoke of Rome—then they extol beyond all measure the excellence of an humble submission to the authority of the priest—or what they term “*foi de charbonnier*” [faith of a charcoal burner—i.e., of an uncultivated, ignorant person]. Such a submission is incessantly placed before the pupil as the basis of all virtue, as the source of every grace, and of every light; and the result is that the neophyte, terrified and cajoled in turns, throws himself unhesitatingly into the extreme opinions opposite to that from which he has been warned. Not only does the shadow of a doubt terrify him—he flies from it as he would from the serpent of impurity. For this is another rule incessantly impressed upon him, that temptations against faith are to be placed in the same category as temptations against chastity: that the only security against such is in flight. Nay, he even goes beyond this—he at last comes to love faith for itself, and for the love of faith to despise, I had almost said to hate, reason. He persuades himself that there is supreme merit in believing without proof; he does not desire to examine, or to be convinced by any examination which he may make—he would rather preserve all the merits of an unreasoning assent.

I have read in the life of St. Louis [Louis IX. of France], that when some of his courtiers came to announce a miracle which he might have an opportunity of witnessing, by which our Lord showed himself visibly in the consecrated host, under the form of a child, the pious monarch replied—“Let those who doubt concerning the real presence in the holy sacrament go and see this miracle: for myself, I believe in that Presence as firmly as if I saw it bodily with my eyes.” I do not hesitate to assert, that the majority of our young ecclesiastics, on leaving the seminary, would be disposed to hold similar language under similar circumstances. Such is the state of belief to which it is possible at length to arrive by willing that one should believe; by continually repeating to one's self “I believe.”

I hope, sir, that your readers can now understand the two things which I proposed to myself to show in this letter—viz., how it happens that (at least in France) a Roman Priest may be sincere in his teaching, and in what sense it is true that he is a man of faith.

I am, with respect,

Your very humble servant,

C. MIEL.

PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Permit me to make a few remarks on that point of Mr. Edmond Power's letter, in your last (No. 35, p. 135), which refers to myself.

The object of my previous letter (No. 31, p. 86) was to expose misquotations made by two of your Roman Catholic correspondents in their endeavour to prove “that the doctrine of Purgatory was taught by the early Fathers.” As Mr. Power has not attempted a justification on this head, I presume that he admits the accuracy of my references. He, however, calls in question one of my statements. He writes—

“Mr. Collette undertakes to disprove Purgatory! and in order to make this conclusion available to the end he proposes, he tells those for whose edification he writes, by an egregious mistake, no doubt, that, ‘according to the modern Roman doctrine, all the faithful—all those who die in the faith of Christ—go to Purgatory, before they can be in a fit condition to appear before God.’” Mr. Power then desires to know whence I learned this novel feature. He does not, however, deny such to be the teaching of his Church. He will admit that his Church makes a broad distinction between those who die in mortal and those in venial sins. Those who die in mortal sin go “to hell for all eternity” (Dr. Doyle's Abridgment of Christian Doctrine), and those who die in venial sins, we are told, “go to Purgatory till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven.” Then we read in the Catechism of the Council of Trent—“Besides this (namely, hell), there is a *purgatorial fire*, where the souls of the pious are, for a certain time, expiated by suffering, by which an entrance may be gained to the eternal abodes, into which nothing unclean can enter.”*

Pope Gregory I. (if, indeed, the work attributed to him by Romanists be genuine) stated, that the fire of Purgatory was for those only who had committed “*peccata minuta atque levissima*.”†

Now, I believe Mr. Power will admit that those who die in venial sin, and the “pious,” such as stated in the Cate-

* Cat. Conc. Trid., pars i., cap. iv., Quest. iii., p. 50. Lips. 1851.
† Gregor. Magn. Dialog., Lib. iv., c. 39.